

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
TYLER DIVISION**

BRANNON PARSONS,

Plaintiff,

v.

TDCJ,

Defendant.

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

Case No. 6:24-cv-284-JDK-KNM

**ORDER ADOPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION  
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Plaintiff Brannon Parsons, a Texas Department of Criminal Justice inmate proceeding pro se, filed this civil rights lawsuit pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Docket No. 1. The case was referred to United States Magistrate Judge K. Nicole Mitchell for findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendations for disposition.

On September 23, 2024, Judge Mitchell issued a Report (Docket No. 7) recommending that Plaintiff's motion for temporary restraining order (Docket No. 3) be denied. A copy of this Report was sent to Plaintiff pm September 23, 2024, but no objections have been received. The Fifth Circuit has explained that where a letter is properly placed in the United States mail, a presumption exists that the letter reached its destination in the usual time and was actually received by the person to whom it was addressed. *Faciane v. Sun Life Assurance Company of Canada*, 931 F.3d 412, 420–21, n.9 (5th Cir. 2019).


This Court reviews the findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge de novo only if a party objects within fourteen days of service of the Report and

Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In conducting a de novo review, the Court examines the entire record and makes an independent assessment under the law. *Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1430 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc), *superseded on other grounds by statute*, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (extending the time to file objections from ten to fourteen days).

Here, Plaintiff did not file objections. The Court therefore reviews the Magistrate Judge's findings for clear error or abuse of discretion and reviews the legal conclusions to determine whether they are contrary to law. *See United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989) (holding that, if no objections to a Magistrate Judge's Report are filed, the standard of review is "clearly erroneous, abuse of discretion and contrary to law").

Having reviewed the Magistrate Judge's Report and the record in this case, the Court finds no clear error or abuse of discretion and no conclusions contrary to law. Accordingly, the Court hereby **ADOPTS** the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge (Docket No. 7) as the findings of this Court. Plaintiff's motion for temporary restraining order (Docket No. 3) is **DENIED**.

So **ORDERED** and **SIGNED** this **30th** day of **January, 2025**.

  
JEREMY D. KERNODLE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE